

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Serial No.: 10/757,079

Examiner: Merrick L. Dixon

Filing Date: January 14, 2004

Group Art Unit: 1774

Inventor: Michael Ian Birrell

Confirmation No. 5345

Title: Multilayer Product Made Out Of A Substrate And On Either Side At Least One Cover Layer; Process For The Manufacture Of A Multilayer Product And Painted Multilayer Product And Process For Painting A Multilayer Product

**APPLICANT INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:


In response to the Examiner's Interview Summary mailed June 7, 2007, Applicant requests entry of the following remarks.

**REMARKS**

A telephone interview was held on May 17, 2007 between the undersigned and Examiner Edwards. Applicant does not disagree that no agreement was reached as indicated in the Interview Summary mailed by the Examiner on June 7, 2007. However, Applicant finds it necessary to offer the following points of clarification with respect to the Examiner's conclusion that "... no agreement could be reached with regard to the New Matter identified in the record." No agreement could be reached with respect to such an assertion because there is no outstanding new matter rejection. The inferential allegation of a new matter rejection of the pending claims has been previously addressed in the Pre-appeal Brief Conference Request filed February 2, 2007. As stated in the Panel Decision mailed March 8, 2007, "A conference has been held. The rejection is withdrawn and a new Office action will be mailed." Subsequent this holding, the only formal action received by the Office from the Examiner has been a Restriction Requirement issued March 20, 2007. During multiple telephone communications since, the Examiner has maintained a general allegation that the pending claims include new matter. Applicant's position has always been that there is no new matter rejection to which Applicant can respond. The record clearly evidences the Examiner's failure to identify the alleged "new matter" and clearly evidences the lack of a new matter rejection.

During the interview, Applicant further requested that the Examiner clearly and concisely set forth in any subsequent action any and all objections/rejections the Examiner may have such that this matter may be allowed to proceed to a resolution.

Respectfully submitted,



Kirk L. Deheck  
Registration No. 55,782  
kld@boylefred.com